

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/625,853	07/22/2003	Tetsuya Okumura	59626 (70904)	8010
21874	7590 02/07/2006		EXAM	INER
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP			DILDINE JR, R STEPHEN	
P.O. BOX 558 BOSTON, M	* · ·		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
·			2133	
			DATE MAILED: 02/07/2000	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/625,853	OKUMURA ET A	AL.
a de Commond	Examiner	Art Unit	
Office Action Summary		2133	1
The MAILING DATE of this communication a	appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence	address
The MAILING DATE of this communication	••	THE THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY	(30) DAYS.
od for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by standard patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	R 1.136(a). In no event, nowever, me	MONTHS from the mailing date of thi	s communication.
tus			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _ 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) 3 3) Since this application is in condition for all closed in accordance with the practice uncertainty.	are expent for formal	matters, prosecution as to C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	the merits is
sposition of Claims 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-40</u> is/are pending in the applications is/are with the size of the size with the size of			
4) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examplication Papers 9) The drawing(s) filed on 22 July 2003 is/are placement drawing sheet(s) including the 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by	and/or election requireme aminer. re: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ to the drawing(s) be held in	nt.] objected to by the Exami abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85	31 CFK 1.12 (W)
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority do 2. Certified copies of the priority do 3. Copies of the certified copies of application from the International	cuments have been receiv cuments have been receiv the priority documents had	ved. ved in Application No ve been received in this N a)).	 ational Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or Paper No(s)/Mail Date 22 July 2003.	O-948)	Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date Notice of Informal Patent Applic Other:	cation (PTO-152) No./Mail Date 01172

Specification

The disclosure is objected to under 1.77(b)(2) for failure to contain, as the first sentence after the title, a reference to the Japanese application upon which priority is being claimed.

Figure 8 does not seem to correspond to the description of Figure 8 appearing at the first full paragraph of page 45 of the specification. In Figure 8, c(0,n) converges to +3 and c(1,n) and c(2,n) converge to -1 while the specification states "The ultimate value was about -1 for c(0,n) and c(2,n) and about +3 for c(1,n)".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 16 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. This claim is directed to a computer program *per se*, which is neither a process, machine, manufacture, nor composition of matter. Claims directed to nothing more than abstract ideas (such as mathematical algorithms), natural phenomena, and laws of nature are not eligible for and therefore are excluded from patent protection. Diehr, 450 U.S. at 185, 209 USPQ at 7; accord, e.g., Chakrabarty, 447 U.S. at 309, 206 USPQ at 197; Parker v. Flook, 437 U.S. 584, 589, 198 USPQ 193, 197 (1978); Benson, 409 U.S. at 67-68, 175 USPQ at 675; Funk, 333 U.S. at 130, 76 USPQ at 281. "A principle, in the abstract, is a fundamental truth; an original cause; a motive; these cannot be patented, as no one can claim in either of them an exclusive right." Le Roy, 55 U.S. (14 How.) at 175. Instead, such "manifestations of laws of nature" are "part of the storehouse of knowledge," "free to all men and reserved exclusively to none." Funk, 333 U.S. at 130, 76 USPQ at 281. Thus, "a new mineral discovered in the earth or a new plant found in the wild is not patentable subject matter" under Section 101. Chakrabarty, 447 U.S. at 309, 206 USPQ at 197. "Likewise, Einstein could not patent his celebrated law that E=mc2; nor could Newton have patented the law of gravity." Ibid. Nor can one patent "a novel and useful mathematical formula," Flook, 437 U.S. at 585, 198 USPQ at 195; electromagnetism or steam power, O'Reilly v. Morse, 56 U.S. (15 How.) 62, 113-114 (1853); or "[t]he qualities of * * * * bacteria, * * * the heat of the sun, electricity, or the qualities of metals,"

Funk, 333 U.S. at 130, 76 USPQ at 281; see Le Roy, 55 U.S. (14 How.) at 175. See also Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure per se held nonstatutory).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The following is a quotation of the sixth paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

An element in a claim for a combination may be expressed as a means or step for performing a specified function without the recital of structure, material, or acts in support thereof, and such claim shall be construed to cover the corresponding structure, material, or acts described in the specification and equivalents thereof.

Claims 16-17 and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first and sixth paragraph, for failure to provide, in the specification, a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using the computer program claimed in claims 16-17, and for failing to provide, in the specification, a disclosure of the corresponding structure, material, or acts which correspond to the claimed computer program functioning as "each of the means" of claim 1 as claimed in claims 16-17. In other words, these claims must be supported by the disclosure of the claimed computer program.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-15, 18-34 and 37-40 are allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: none of the cited reference teach or fairly suggest a combination having both a path metric difference detection and an equalization means responsive thereof as recited in claims 1-15 and 26-28. Further, none of the cited references teach or fairly suggest a target value register as recited in claims 18-25, Further, none of the cited references teach or fairly suggest a combination having both a path metric difference detection and specific pattern detection as recited in claims 29-34 and 37-40.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Rafie et al. (2002/0196844) is cited to show an adaptive equalizer, Xia et al. (2002/0186762) shows a system wherein an error signal is generated by subtracting an output of the decision feedback equalizer from an output of the decision device, the error signal being used to update coefficients of the taps of the FIR filter and the decision feedback equalizer, Aizawa et al. (2002/0181574) shows using a training section to adjust the taps of an adaptive equalizer followed by a path metric computation section, Campello De Souza et al. (2002/0129318), Marukawa (6,836,511) and Atsushi et al. (EP 1 006 527 A1) show an equalizer followed by a Viterbi decoder, McClellan (6735724) is cited to show the use of a path metric difference at the state with the smallest resulting state metric to adjust coefficients in a FIR filter, Visotsky et al. (6175588) is cited to show comparing a pilot channel estimate with a predetermined data pattern to produce an error signal used to control an equalizer, Nobakht et al. (5,692,011) is cited to show a trainee system having a Viterbi means used to adjust the coefficients of a feed forward filter and Naoiet al. (5,479,419) shows a Viterbi algorithm processor with feedback to a channel estimator. Hayamizu (JP 06303099) is cited to show controlling the coefficient of a filter based upon the results of a Viterbi decoder, Kashiwabara et al (JP 2003123402) shows controlling an equalizer by the difference between the output of a Viterbi decoder and an idealized signal, Ishibashi et al., V. Lin et al., Chakraborty et al. and Minn et al. show various adaptive ARQ schemes, M. Lin et al. teaches an pragmatic trellis coding in an adaptive ARQ environment and Sklar is cited for his teachings about maximum liklihood sequence estimation.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to R. Stephen Dildine whose telephone number is (571) 272-3820. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F 5:30 am to 2:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert Decady can be reached on (571) 272-3819. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

R. Stephen Dildine Primary Examiner Art Unit 2133

R. Stephen Dildine